```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
                      IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 7
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 8
 9
    SUSAN BOWMAN, an individual; and
    DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT,
10
    EDUCATION SERVICES:
                          HELPING YOU
    HELP OTHERS, a California public
11
    benefit corporation,
12
                                              2:04-cv-0755-GEB-PAN
                         Plaintiffs,
13
                                              ORDER
              V.
14
    BEST WESTERN STATION HOUSE INN;
15
    THE WILLIFORD FAMILY PARTNERSHIP,
    L.P., a California limited
16
    partnership; BEST WESTERN INTER-
    NATIONAL, INC., an Arizona
17
    corporation and LEWIS T. WILLIFORD,
    an individual dba BEST WESTERN
18
    STATION HOUSE INN,
19
                         Defendants.
20
21
              On December 13, 2005, Defendant Best Western International,
22
    Inc. ("BWI"), filed a motion requesting leave to file a summary
23
    judgment motion ("Motion") for hearing after the law and motion
2.4
    deadline prescribed by the Rule 16 Scheduling Order governing this
25
    action. (See Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order, July 5, 2005.)
26
27
              All references to Rule 16 refer to Federal Rule of Civil
28
    Procedure 16.
```

Case 2:04-cv-00755-GEB-PAN Document 34 Filed 12/15/05 Page 2 of 2

On December 13, 2005, BWI also filed an ex parte application requesting that the Motion be briefed and heard on shortened time.

Rule 16 allows a Scheduling Order to be modified upon a showing of good cause. BWI argues that good cause exists because its counsel failed to calender the law and motion cut-off date due to inadvertence, mistake, and/or neglect. In addition, BWI argues good cause exists because a "favorable disposition on the motion for summary judgment will completely dispose of the matter against BWI . . . [and] will also reduce the number of issues and witnesses at trial." However, a calendering mistake or the possibility of a favorable disposition do not constitute "good cause" under Rule 16(b). See Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607-08 (9th Cir. 1992) (stating that the "good cause" standard focuses on the diligence of the party seeking modification). Therefore the Motion is denied. See id. (concluding that if the party seeking modification fails to demonstrate diligence "the inquiry should end"). application to shorten time is also denied because it no longer concerns a pending motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 14, 2005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr. GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge

2